

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 and 12-29 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 16, 17, 18 are amended and claims 19-29 are added. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in the specification on page 20. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8, 10, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,271,823 to Gordon et al. (hereinafter "Gordon 823") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,184,856 to Gordon et al. (hereinafter "Gordon 856") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,392,732 to Oh-e et al. (hereinafter "Oh-e"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The applied references, even if combined, fail to teach a "filter . . . divided into plural chromatic regions and plural achromatic regions, the achromatic regions being configured to transmit a reflected light reflected by one kind of the particles to an outside of the reflective image display medium," as recited in claim 1. The Office Action concedes that neither Gordon 823 nor Gordon 856 teach a filter divided into plural chromatic regions and plural achromatic regions.

Oh-e fails to remedy the deficiency in Gordon 823 and 856. Specifically, Oh-e fails to teach "achromatic regions being configured to transmit a reflected light reflected by one kind of the particles to an outside of the reflective image display medium." The Office Action asserts that the black matrix 22a and 22b, as taught by Oh-e, corresponds to the claimed "plural chromatic regions and plural achromatic regions." However, Oh-e fails to teach achromatic regions configured to transmit a reflected light reflected by one kind of the particles to an outside of the reflective image display medium. Because Oh-e fails to teach that the black matrix is configured to transmit reflected light in the manner claimed, the asserted combination of references fails to teach all of the features of claim 1.

Thus, for at least this reason, independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Further, claims 2-8, 10, 12 and 13, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable over the applied references for at least the reason discussed above, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gordon 823 in view of Gordon '856 and further in view of Oh-e and U.S. Patent No. 6,376,828 to Comiskey. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Comiskey fails to remedy the above-described deficiencies of the other applied references with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 14-15 are allowable at least for their dependence on claim 1. Independent claims 16-18 are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above in reference to independent claim 1. Specifically, the applied references, even if combined, fail to disclose "achromatic regions being configured to transmit a reflected light reflected by one kind of the particles to an outside of the reflective image display medium [or device]." Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gordon 823 in view of Gordon 856 and further in view of Oh-e and U.S. Patent No. 5,872,654 to Shirochi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Shirochi fails to remedy the above-described deficiencies of the other applied references with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claim 9 is patentable at least for its dependence on claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, new claims 19-29 are presented. New claims 19-29 each recite "achromatic regions being configured to transmit a reflected light reflected by the first

particles to an outside of the reflective image display medium," similarly to independent claim 1. For at least this reason, new claims 19-29 are believed to be patentable over the applied references. Prompt examination and allowance of new claims 19-29 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10 and 12-29 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse D. Sukman  
Registration No. 54,477

JAO:JDS/jnm

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time  
Amendment Transmittal

Date: October 14, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--